



3004094747

0 5917 3004094747



THE GENERAL LIBRARIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

From the Library of

Dr. Edward Taborsky

"FRIENDS OF EUROPE" PUBLICATIONS

Price 3d.

No. 74.

OBJECTS :

1. To encourage effective co-operation for the prevention of war and the establishment of peace.
2. To provide accurate information about Nazi Germany for use throughout Great Britain, the British Empire, the U.S.A., Europe and wherever the English tongue is known.

POLAND: BRITISH AND GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY

SPEECHES

by

ADOLF HITLER

and

LORD HALIFAX

ISSUED BY FRIENDS OF EUROPE,
122, ST. STEPHEN'S HOUSE,
WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.1

add 110
NIPC
UTCH
ET
Pm-Rud
rft

The attention of readers of this pamphlet is drawn to the following previous pamphlet publications in this series:—

- No. 34—Hitler the Man: Adolf Hitler, with a Foreword by Henry W. Nevinson.
- No. 37—The Racial Conception of the World: Adolf Hitler, with a Foreword by Sir Charles Grant Robertson.
- No. 38—Germany's Foreign Policy: Adolf Hitler, with a Foreword by the Duchess of Atholl, M.P.
- No. 41—The Nazi Party, The State and Religion: Adolf Hitler, with a Foreword by Dr. Hugh Dalton, M.P.
- No. 43—Nazi Activities in South West Africa, with a Foreword by Lord Lugard.
- No. 60—Adolf Hitler's Reichstag Speech, 20th February, 1938.
- No. 61—The End of Austria: The Speeches of Dr. von Schuschnigg and Adolf Hitler.
- No. 62—The Austrian Crisis and British Foreign Policy: Speeches by the Rt. Hon. Anthony Eden, M.P., the Prime Minister (The Rt. Hon. Neville Chamberlain, M.P.), and the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, M.P.
- No. 69—The Nazi International, with a Foreword by Sir John Murray, K.C.V.O., D.S.O.
- No. 70—The Redistribution of the World: Adolf Hitler's Reichstag Speech, with a Foreword by Viscount Cranborne, M.P.

Copies of these pamphlets may be had for 3d. each, or 2/6 the set of ten, post free, on application to:

The Secretary, Friends of Europe, 122, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, London, S.W.1.

NOTE

This pamphlet reproduces, for comparison and reference, the last two speeches of *Adolf Hitler* and the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, *Lord Halifax*.

The speech of *Adolf Hitler* was delivered at a Congress of German Ex-Servicemen at Cassel on the 4th June and expresses the vindication of the German total-military State.

The historic speech, as it has come to be regarded, of *Lord Halifax*, was delivered at the annual dinner of the Royal Institute of International Affairs on the 29th June.

The text of both speeches is verbatim. Paragraph headings are inserted for convenience and are not textually a part of the speeches.

The third section includes representative German comment on the *Halifax* speech, as well as some *Hitler* promises given during the 1938 Czechoslovak crisis, representing a parallel to the Polish crisis of 1939.

How Poland regards the "Polish crisis" is expressed in the authoritative statement issued from Warsaw on July 7, and which is reproduced from "The Times" of July 8, 1939:

"The three main pillars on which the position of Poland in Danzig rests and must continue to rest were authoritatively recapitulated in Warsaw to-night as follows:—

- (1) **Danzig must remain free from incorporation in the German Reich;**
- (2) **Danzig must remain within the Polish Customs system;**
- (3) **Polish rights and privileges must remain free of control exercised by any foreign power.**

Within this framework (it was added) there is ample scope for the free development of the rights, culture, and privileges of the German majority who inhabit the Free City as well as for the similarly free development of the rights of the Polish minority living there which must also be fully respected. As to the present situation in Danzig, it was being watched with close attention. Poland has little interest, however, in mere words and displays, and is guided by facts, the realities of developments apart from the adornment given them by orators and agitations in the Press."

London,
July 8, 1939.

POLAND: BRITISH AND GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY

(1)

ADOLF HITLER'S SPEECH TO GERMAN EX-SERVICEMEN

June 4, 1939

Addressing the Congress of Greater Germany's Ex-Servicemen at Cassel on June 4, 1939, *Herr Hitler* said that he spoke to the ex-soldiers both as a soldier of the Great War and as *Fuehrer* and Chancellor of the German *Volk* and Reich:

Herr Hitler's Idea of Germany 25 years ago.

"As an old soldier I greet you with the feeling of comradeship, which, in its profoundest meaning, may only be experienced by a man who witnessed the noblest glorification of this idea in the War. For only a man, who saw how this manly community prevailed throughout the most difficult tests of courage and loyalty, will be able to understand its most glorious significance. Almost 25 years have elapsed since those weeks, days, and hours, the recollection of which moves us deeply even to-day, when the German *Volk* was compelled to fight for its existence after a long and peacefully guarded time of prosperous development. And 20 years have elapsed since, after a resistance of a heroism which is without parallel, that *Diktat* was forced upon us, which was theoretically designed to give a new order to the world, but which, in practice, was doomed to destroy every reasonable order based on the recognition of the most natural vital rights. On the other hand, how enormous is the change by which the Reich, which was doomed to perish, was in the end nevertheless saved from the intended annihilation, and by which it was led to a new recovery, which, in our opinion, is better founded, and, above all, more permanent, than any similar event in our former German history!

"When I, in my capacity as Leader of the nation, consider things with a critical mind, I face again and again a question which I consider of the greatest importance not only for our fate

at that time, but also for the right shaping of our future, viz., the question whether or not the events of that time could have been avoided.

"Twenty years ago a miserable State leadership was pressed by a force, which it probably considered irresistible, to sign a document trying to impose on Germany the blame for the war, as if that were finally proved. In the meantime scientific investigations proved that these allegations were nothing but lies and falsifications. I myself solemnly withdrew this signature, placed against better knowledge under the Versailles *Diktat*, thus giving truth its due in outward appearance as well."

(*Herr Hitler* withdrew Germany's signature by a declaration made in his *Reichstag* speech of January 30, 1937.)

Herr Hitler's Idea of a Germany without War Aims: 1914-1918.

"But, irrespective of all these things, we must be aware of one factor: war-guilt is inseparably linked up with the elaboration of war-aims. Neither a nation nor a political regime will wage war for its own sake. Only in the brains of perverted Jewish scribblers can the idea be hatched out that anyone might launch a war out of the mere lust to kill and to shed blood.

"Now, it was a decisive thing that the German Government had not war aims not only previous to 1914, but that even during the war they could not make up their minds about any reasonable or even precise war intentions. On the other hand, the Peace Treaty of Versailles made it clear what the real war intentions of the then British and French politicians of encirclement had been: the robbery of the German colonies, the annihilation of German trade, the destruction of the very basis of German existence and therefore of German life, the liquidation of the political influence and power of Germany, consequently the very same aims which the British and French politicians of encirclement follow also to-day.

"At that time there were, unfortunately, some individuals in Germany, who thought that they should not believe the radical announcements voiced in peace-time already in the British Press and by British statesmen, with regard to the necessity of taking away our colonies and of destroying German trade. The Great War and the Peace *Diktat* of Versailles taught the German *Volk* a different lesson. What had formerly appeared to be the product of the imagination and hatred of ostensibly irresponsible politicians, turned out to be the aim of British policy after all, viz., the robbery of the German colonies, the annihilation of Ger-

man trade, the destruction of the German merchant fleet, suffocation of the political power and destruction of the Reich, in other words the political and physical extermination of the German Volk. Such were the aims of the British policy of encirclement previous to 1914."

Herr Hitler's Idea of Unprepared Germany in 1914.

"It is well that we should now remember that the *then* German State leadership confronted without any aims on its own part, and, unfortunately also without any determined will, the intentions and war aims of our enemies, the nature of which was later proved by the Peace *Diktat* of Versailles. Thus it was possible not only that there existed no German war aims, but also that the necessary German preparations for a war, even in the sense of an effective defence, were not made. And this is perhaps Germany's gravest guilt with regard to the Great War, viz., the guilt of having literally made it easier to a surrounding world by neglecting German armaments to propagate the idea of annihilating Germany, and, in the end, to put this idea into practice.

"With arguments, which we are to-day unable to understand, essential armaments were cut down as late as 1912, ridiculous sums were grudged, resolute soldiers who opposed such tendencies were sent away, and the conviction of the enemies was thereby confirmed that after all they might risk a war against Germany with a chance of success. In addition to this the military training of the German nation was not complete, and hundreds of thousands of fit men thus lacked instruction. When, at a critical time, they were later finally enrolled, a large percentage of them paid for this neglect with their lives. All this rounds off the picture of an incapable State leadership, and thereby of the only real guilt, not of the outbreak of the war, but of the turn it took. If, in spite of all this, the Great War, of all things, is a source of proudest recollections for us Germans, this is certainly not the case because of our armaments, which were much too weak, nor because of the inadequate State leadership, but exclusively because, as instrument of the German forces, the Army, the Navy, and the later Air Force demonstrated their unique inner value in the Great War. Though they were often outnumbered many times by their enemies, they never found a rival of their inner value."

Conclusions which Herr Hitler draws from the Past "Innocence" and "Unpreparedness" of Germany.

"Remembering and looking back at that great time, we all,

my comrades, must make a firm resolution and be convinced of the following :—

"1. We are convinced that the German *Volk* may look back on its past, and, in particular, on the years of the Great War, with the greatest pride. As *Fuehrer* of the German *Volk* and as ex-serviceman I cannot admit for a moment that anyone amongst our Western enemies should be entitled to believe that he is better or more worth than we Germans. For this reason I do not suffer in the least from any inferiority complex whatsoever. On the contrary, the recollection of the four years of the Great War, which, thanks to a gracious Providence, I had the good luck to experience, is for me only a reason to put my proudest trust in the German *Volk*, and, as a soldier, also in myself. Owing to the knowledge of the fearful terrors of war, those years have made us at heart as peace-loving as, on the other hand, I am firm in the determination to defend our rights, and to trust the quality of the German soldiers. For this reason threats, from whatever side they may come, make no impression on me.

"2. I, like all of us, was, from that time on, resolved never again to neglect in such a criminal way the interests of the Reich and the nation, as they were neglected prior to 1914.

"And, my old comrades, I can assure you of the following :

"Though the British policy of encirclement has remained the same as before the War, the German policy of defence has completely changed! It has changed, to begin with, owing to the fact that the Reich is to-day not led by a civilian who is disguised as a Major, but by a soldier, though he may, perhaps, sometimes wear civilian clothes. In the German State leadership of to-day there are no *Bethmann-Hollwegs*.

"I have seen to it that only hundred per cent. men and soldiers should have anything to do with the leadership of the State. And, if I happen to notice that a man is not fit for his job then I shall instantly remove such a creature from his post, whoever he may be.

"The Peace Diktat of Versailles did not originate by accident. It was the aim of those who had been endeavouring for years to encircle Germany, and who had finally attained their goal. We have no right to doubt that the same policy is being pursued to-day and with a view to attaining the same aim. Hence we have the duty to tell the nation the undisguised truth, and to strengthen to the utmost its defensive will and its defensive strength. I believe that by so doing I also act in accordance with those comrades, who had once to sacrifice their lives for Germany, unfortunately in vain as it seemed at that time. On

the whole I think that, 25 years after the outbreak of the Great War, and 20 years after the *Diktat* of Versailles, the German State leadership, and with it the whole German *Volk*, may again approach the tombs of our heroes, for the first time with raised heads. At least part of the mistakes which were then committed through weakness, lack of determination and aims, and discord, has now been repaired.

Herr Hitler describes his Total-Military State of To-day.

"I therefore expect old soldiers, not only to hail this policy of strengthening the German defensive power, but also to support it with the greatest fanaticism. However, this policy must not only recognise its aim in dressing up every year one annual class of civilians as temporary soldiers, but in principle in educating the whole nation as soldiers, and in giving it a soldierly attitude.

"It is not an accident that National-Socialism originated in the Great War. For it is nothing but the penetration of our entire life by the spirit of true fighters for the benefit of the *Volk* and the Reich.

"One thing, however, should be beyond all doubt for all of us : once the German nation possesses a leadership which, in its entirety, is heroic, it will, by its whole attitude, respond to this leadership. **It is my unshakable decision to see to it that the supreme political and military leaders of the nation should think and act as courageously as the brave musketeer must act and think, who has, and also fulfils, the duty of giving his life if this is required by an order or by necessity. The heroic leadership of a nation is always based on the consciousness which receives its commands from questions involving the life and death of a nation.**

Herr Hitler envisages the Greater Territorial Germany to Come.

"My comrades! If I speak to you like this to-day, I can claim the justification to do so before the face of German history. This justification is given to a man, who not only uttered words, but who proved by his actions that he adheres to this spirit and mentality. This is why I can take a greater part than anyone else in our great comradeship of eternal German soldiery. Over us shines the glory of the recollection of the greatest era of our Volk and of our own lives, and in front of us lies the fulfilment of that for which that time, too, though unconsciously, had struggled: Greater Germany!"

(2)

TEXT OF LORD HALIFAX'S SPEECH.

June 29, 1939

Changes in British Foreign Policy within the Past Year.*Lord Halifax said :*

"When I look back to the speech which I delivered at the Chatham House Dinner in June a year ago, I am conscious, as we all are, of the great changes that have taken place. A year ago we had undertaken no specific commitments on the Continent of Europe, beyond those which had then existed for some considerable time and are familiar to you all. To-day we are bound by new agreements for mutual defence with Poland and Turkey : we have guaranteed assistance to Greece and Roumania against aggression, and we are now engaged with the Soviet Government in a negotiation, to which I hope there may very shortly be a successful issue, with a view to associating them with us for the defence of States in Europe whose independence and neutrality may be threatened. **We have assumed obligations, and are preparing to assume more, with full understanding of their causes and with full understanding of their consequences. We know that, if the security and independence of other countries are to disappear, our own security and our own independence will be gravely threatened. We know that if international law and order is to be preserved, we must be prepared to fight in its defence.**

"In the past we have always stood out against the attempt by any single Power to dominate Europe at the expense of the liberties of other nations, and British policy is, therefore, only following the inevitable line of its own history, if such an attempt were to be made again.

A United Britain.

"But it is not enough to state a policy. What matters is, firstly, to convince the nation that the policy is right, and, secondly, to take the steps necessary for that policy to succeed. I believe that at no time since the War has there been such national unity on the main essentials of our foreign policy, and that with this spirit of unity goes a deep and wide-spread determination to make that policy effective. But I believe, too, that among all classes of our people who, in virtue of their common citizenship, are being called upon to defend their country, and the causes for which it stands, there is an increasing desire to look beyond the immediate present, and to see before them some goal

for which they would willingly sacrifice their leisure and, if need be, their lives.

"We are already asking for great sacrifices from all ages and classes in the call for national service. In one way and another, every man and woman has a part to play, and I know is prepared to do so. The immense effort that the country is making in equipping itself for defence at sea, in the air and on land is without parallel in peace time. We have an unchallengeable navy. Our Air Force, still undergoing an expansion which has outstripped all expectations of a few months ago, has now nothing to fear from any other. I have little doubt that its personnel, in spirit and in skill, is superior to all others. Our army, once derided, but which survived to prove its worth so that it made a boast or that derision, is, no doubt, small in comparison with that of some other countries. But, as happened once before, we are creating here also a powerful weapon for the defence of our own liberty and that of other peoples. With every week that passes, that effort gains momentum, and on every side of life, political, administrative, industrial, we have abundant evidence of how firmly this national effort is driven and supported by the people's will. Behind all our military effort stands the British people, more united than ever before, and at their service their wealth and industrial resources. These again are the object of contemptuous reference, but they have been earned by the labour, skill and courage of our people. **None of this formidable array of strength will be called into play except in defence against aggression. No blow will be struck, no shot fired. Of the truth of that, everyone in this country is convinced. I believe myself that most people in other countries really accept it in spite of the propaganda that dings into their ears the contrary. What is also now fully and universally accepted in this country, but what may not even yet be as well understood elsewhere, is that, in the event of further aggression, we are resolved to use at once the whole of our strength in fulfilment of our pledges to resist it.**

Provocative Insults.

"These great changes in our national life could not indeed be brought about, were they not backed by deep conviction, which is immensely strengthened by what we hear and read almost daily from other parts of the world. We are often told that, though once we were a great nation, our ways are now old-fashioned, and that our democracy has no life in it. We read the mischievous misrepresentations of our actions and of our motives, which some people in countries holding a different international philosophy from our own think fit to make. We read them with resentment, knowing that they are false and knowing

that those who make them know it too. These things do not pass unnoticed here, nor, I may say, do provocative insults offered to our fellow-countrymen further afield. I can say at once that Great Britain is not prepared to yield either to calumnies or force. It may afford some satisfaction to those who have pronounced our nation to be decadent to learn that they themselves have found the cure—and one most effective. Every insult that is offered to our people, every rude challenge that is made to what we value and are determined to defend, only unites us, increases our determination and strengthens our loyalty to those others who share our feelings and aspirations. Over a large part of the world the old standards of conduct and of ordinary human decency, which man had laboriously built up, are being set aside. Things are being done to-day which we can hardly read without amazement; so alien are they to our conception of how men should deal with their fellow-men. Rules of conduct between nations are overridden with the same callous indifference as rules of conduct between man and man.

Respect for our Fellow-Men.

"The first thing, therefore, which we have to do is to see that our own standards of conduct do not deteriorate. On that point there must be—and I know there is—complete national unity. We respect our fellow-men. We know that without that there can be no real self-respect either for individuals, or in the long run for nations. The day that we lose our respect for our fellow-men, our democracy would have lost something on which its vitality depends, and would justly become what our critics like to think it, moribund and dead, for it would indeed have lost the right to live. If then we hold fast to these principles, what is the application of them to our foreign policy? At a time when our aims are being constantly misrepresented, it is perhaps well to restate them boldly and with such plainness of speech as I can command. And I would try to deal briefly both with our aims in the immediate present, and our aims in the future; what we are doing now and what we should like to see done as soon as circumstances make it possible.

Our first resolve is to stop aggression. I need not recapitulate the acts of aggression which have taken place, or the effect they have had upon the general trust that European nations feel able to place in words and undertakings. For that reason and for that reason alone we have joined with other nations to meet a common danger. These arrangements we all know, and the world knows, have no purpose other than defence. They mean what they say—no more and no less. But they have been denounced as aiming at the isolation—or as it is called the encirclement—of

Germany and Italy, and as designed to prevent them from acquiring the living space necessary for their national existence. I shall deal with these charges to-night and I propose to do so with complete frankness.

"Germany is Isolating Herself."

"We are told that our motives are to isolate Germany within a ring of hostile States, to stifle her natural outlets, to cramp and throttle the very existence of a great nation. What are the facts? They are very simple and everybody knows them. Germany is isolating herself, and doing it most successfully and completely. She is isolating herself from other countries economically by her policy of autarky, politically by a policy that causes constant anxiety to other nations, and culturally by her policy of racialism. **If you deliberately isolate yourself from others by your own actions you can blame nobody but yourself, and so long as this isolation continues, the inevitable consequences of it are bound to become stronger and more marked. The last thing we desire is to see the individual German man, or woman, or child suffering privations; but if they do so, the fault does not lie with us and it depends on Germany and Germany alone whether this process of isolation continues or not, for any day it can be ended by a policy of co-operation.** It is well that this should be stated plainly so that there may be no misunderstanding here or elsewhere.

"Lebensraum."

"I come next to *Lebensraum*. This word, of which we have not heard the last, needs to be fairly and carefully examined. Every developed community is, of course, faced with the vital problem of living space. But the problem is not solved simply by acquiring more territory. That may indeed only make the problem more acute. It can only be solved by wise ordering of the affairs of a country at home, and by adjusting and improving its relations with other countries abroad. Nations expand their wealth, and raise the standard of living of their people by gaining the confidence of their neighbours, and thus facilitating the flow of goods between them. The very opposite is likely to be the consequence of action by one nation in suppression of the independent existence of her smaller and weaker neighbours. And if *Lebensraum* is to be applied in that sense, we reject it and must resist its application. It is noteworthy that this claim to 'living space' is being put forward at a moment when Germany has become an immigration country, importing workers in large numbers from Czechoslovakia, Holland and Italy to meet the needs of her industry and agriculture. How then can Germany

claim to be overpopulated? Belgium and Holland, and to a less extent our own islands, have already proved that what is called overpopulation can be prevented by productive work. The wide spaces and the natural resources of the British Empire and the United States of America were not able to save them from widespread distress during the great slump of 1929 to 1932. Economically the world is far too closely knit together for any one country to hope to profit itself at the expense of its neighbours, and no more than any other country can Germany hope to solve her economic problems in isolation. It is no doubt impossible at present for us to foresee the day when all trade everywhere will be completely free. But it is possible to make arrangements, given the opportunities, which would greatly enlarge the area of freedom. Through co-operation—and we, for our part, are ready to co-operate—there is ample scope for extending to all nations the opportunity of a larger economic life with all that this means, which is implied in the term '*Lebensraum*'.

Possibilities of Co-operation and Trade.

"If the world were organised on such lines, neither Germany nor Italy need fear for her own safety and no nation could fail to profit from the immense material benefits which the general application of science has brought within universal reach. But no such society of nations can be built upon force, in a world which lives in fear of violence, and has to spend its substance in preparing to resist it. It is idle to cry peace where there is no peace, or to pretend to reach a settlement unless it can be guaranteed by the reduction of warlike preparations, and by the assured recognition of every nation's right to the free enjoyment of its independence. At this moment the doctrine of force bars the way to settlement, and fills the world with envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitableness. But if the doctrine of force were once abandoned, so that the fear of war that stalks the world was lifted, all outstanding questions would become easier to solve. If all the effort which is now devoted to the senseless multiplication of armaments, with the consequent increase of insecurity and distrust, were to be applied to the common peaceful development of resources the peoples of the world would soon find an incentive to work together for the common good; they would realise that their true interests do not conflict, and that progress and well-being depend upon community of aim and effort. The nations would then be in a position to discuss with real promise of success both political grievances and economic difficulties, whether in the international or colonial field.

Colonies.

"This brings me to say something about the principles of our colonial administration. There was a time when in the British

Empire, as elsewhere, colonies were regarded merely as a source of wealth and a place of settlement for Europeans. You have only to read any of the colonial literature of those days to see for how little counted the rights and welfare of the natives. But during the last half-century a very different view has gained ground, a view which has been finely expressed in Article 22 of the Covenant, namely, that the well-being and development of 'people not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world' is 'a sacred trust of civilisation.'

The Irish Example.

"That trust has been steadily fulfilled since the War in the case of the Mandated Territories, on which the operation of the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant has conferred immense benefits. The British Commonwealth is fully aware of the heavy responsibility resting upon it to see that, through respect for these principles, continuity and development is assured to the native populations. The mandatory system, in fact, derives from exactly the same inspiration as that which governs British colonial administrative policy. We have applied the same principles to India and Burma, where they are now steadily at work on a scale that twenty or thirty years ago would have seemed far beyond the bounds of reasonable expectation. Within the last few years we have seen the transformation of Eire into a separate and independent member of the British Commonwealth, enjoying with our other partners of the Empire full Dominion status. For many years we tried, as the phrase went, to hold Ireland, under the mistaken belief, which is to-day invoked to justify the subjection of Czechoslovakia, that it was indispensable to our national security. But we have now realised that our safety is not diminished but immeasurably increased by a free and friendly Ireland. And so both here and in every country for which we have been responsible we have steadily moved in one direction. The whole picture is a significant and faithful reflection of British thought, projected into political form, and expressing itself, through history and now, in the development of institutions. We recognise, as the United States have recognised, that self-government should be the ultimate goal of colonial policy, a goal which is near or distant according to the capacity of the peoples concerned to manage their own affairs. In one of your own studies, 'The Colonial Problem', the type of research which enhances the name and reputation of Chatham House, you have considered the question whether colonies pay. You drew attention to the benefits of cheap imports which the consumers of a country possessing colonies obtain as the result of the relatively low cost of production of certain commodities in colonial territories. But under an international system under which the present trade barriers were to a

great extent abolished, those benefits, already shared as they are to a considerable extent by many countries not possessing colonies, would be shared still more widely. On all sides there could be more free and ready access to markets and raw materials of the world; wider channels of trade down which would flow the goods which nations require to buy and sell. Such are some of the possibilities within everybody's reach.

"How does all this affect our wider problems? One of the most significant facts in world history is the extent to which the principle of trusteeship has come to be adopted in the British Commonwealth during the last 30 years, and there is surely something here that can be used for the great benefit of mankind. Can we not look forward to a time when there may be agreement on common methods and aims of colonial development, which may ensure not only that the universally acknowledged purpose of colonial administration will be to help their inhabitants steadily to raise their level of life, but also that colonial territories may make a growing contribution to the world's resources? On such an agreed foundation of purpose we hope that others might be prepared with us to make their contribution to a better world. If so, I have no doubt that in the conduct of our colonial administration we should be ready to go far upon the economic side, as we have already done on the political side, in making wider application of the principles which now obtain in the mandated territories, including, on terms of reciprocity, that of the open door. Whatever may be the difficulties of the colonial problem, or of any other, I would not despair of finding ways of settlement, once everybody has got the will to settle. But unless all countries do in fact desire a settlement, discussions would only do more harm than good. It is moreover impossible to negotiate with a Government whose responsible spokesmen brand a friendly country as thieves and blackmailers and indulge in daily monstrous slanders on British policy in all parts of the world. But if that spirit, which is clearly incompatible with any desire for a peaceful settlement, gave way to something different, His Majesty's Government would be ready to pool their best thought with others in order to end the present state of political and economic insecurity. If we could get so far, what an immense stride the world would have made! We should have exorcised the anxiety which is cramping and arresting business expansion and we should have brought back an atmosphere of confidence among nations and assurance for the future among the youth of this and every other European country. Our next task would be the reconstruction of the international order on a broader and firmer foundation. That is too large a topic for me to embark upon this evening, but I should like to commend it to your thinking.

The League's "Failure": Possibilities of a "better European System".

"We must ask ourselves how far the failure of the League was due to shortcomings in the Covenant itself, or how far it was the absence of some of the greatest countries at every stage of its history that has crippled both its moral authority and strength. Is it beyond the political genius of mankind to reconcile national individuality with international collaboration? Can human purpose rise high enough to solve the riddle? An examination of the history of the Covenant may perhaps disclose that some of its obligations were too loose and others too rigid. It has been suggested, for instance, that some system of specific regional guarantees for the preservation of the peace would be more effective than the indefinite but universal obligations of Articles 10 and 16, and it is not impossible that the grouping of the Powers as it exists to-day, instead of dividing Europe, might be so moulded as to become the embryo of a better European system.

"That is one side of the problem. But it is not enough to devise measures for preventing the use of force to change the *status quo*, unless there is also machinery for bringing about peaceful change. For a living and changing world can never be held in iron clamps, and any such attempt is the high road to disaster. Changes in the relations, needs, and outlook of nations are going on all the time. And there is no more urgent need, if we are ever to find a workable system of international organisation, than to invent peaceful means by which such changes can be handled. To-day when the European nations, forgetful of their common civilisation, are arming to the teeth, it is more important than ever that we should remind ourselves of the essential unity of European civilisation. European minds meet across political frontiers. With the same background of knowledge, with the same heritage of culture, they study the same problems; the work of the great masters of science, and literature or art is the common property of all peoples; and thinkers in every land exchange knowledge on equal and friendly terms. Truly is a divided Europe a house divided against itself. Our foreign policy must, therefore, constantly bear in mind the immediate present and the more distant future, the steps we are now taking and the goal to which they are meant to lead.

Foundation of British Foreign Policy.

"I have strained your patience, but if you will allow me a few moments more I will endeavour to pick up the threads of my thought and perhaps make a few points more explicit. **British policy rests on twin foundations of purpose. One is determina-**

tion to resist force. The other is our recognition of the world's desire to get on with the constructive work of building peace. If we could once be satisfied that the intentions of others were the same as our own, and that we all really wanted peaceful solutions—then, I say here definitely, we could discuss the problems that are to-day causing the world anxiety. In such a new atmosphere we could examine the colonial problem, the questions of raw materials, trade barriers, the issue of 'Lebensraum', the limitation of armaments, and any other issue that affects the lives of all European citizens.

"But that is not the position which we face to-day. The threat of military force is holding the world to ransom, and our immediate task is—and here I end as I began—to resist aggression. I would emphasise that to-night with all the strength at my command, so that nobody may misunderstand it. And if we are ever to succeed in removing misunderstanding and reaching a settlement which the world can trust, it must be upon some basis more substantial than verbal undertakings.

Deeds not Words.

"It has been said that deeds, not words, are necessary. That also is our view. There must be give and take in practical form on both sides, for there can be no firm bargains on the basis of giving something concrete in return for mere assurances. None of us can in these days see very far ahead in the world in which we live, but we can and must always be sure of the general direction in which we wish to travel. Let us, therefore, be very sure that, whether or not we are to preserve for ourselves and for others the things that we hold dear, depends in the last resort upon ourselves, upon the strength of the personal faith of each one of us, and upon our resolution to maintain it."

(3)

THE GERMAN TREATMENT OF THE HALIFAX SPEECH

(a) The *Völkischer Beobachter*, July 1, 1939.

The official press of Germany was plainly under instruction not to reproduce the text of the speech of Lord Halifax. Only fragments, with comment, were reproduced. The *Völkischer Beobachter*—the official daily organ of Herr Hitler and the National-Socialist Party—may be taken as typical. It reproduced about 250 words of the speech and even this short text contained

only few verbatim quotations. On this basis of information to its readers, the following editorial appeared :—

"Twenty-four hours after the provocative British note on the naval question had been presented in Berlin, Lord Halifax thought it advisable to address Germany in an even more provocative tone. It would be futile to examine whether this speech contains any new points of view. It expresses exactly the same thoughts by which British statesmen have recently tried on repeated occasions to justify their policy of encirclement which is directed against the Axis. The only thing we can discover in the British Foreign Secretary's speech is that it marks a new culmination of the British propaganda offensive, which had been announced quite openly by the British Government in the course of the past few days.

"Lord Halifax, moreover, succeeded again in talking round the core of the problems. His phrase about constructive proposals lacks all practical preliminary conditions so long as the British Government continues to refrain from making on its own part a constructive contribution to European politics. Must we remind the world once more of the fact that it was not the British Government, but the *Fuehrer* of Greater Germany, who expressed his readiness to render the peace of Europe an active service by making his far-reaching proposals to Poland? This proposition only failed to materialise because of British encirclement and British influence on Poland's attitude. Words about independence and freedom sound ill if uttered by a statesman, whose Government is at the very same moment ready to sacrifice without any scruples the liberty and independence of the small Baltic States for the sake of a dangerous policy of encirclement. It will, after all, suffice to refer to the brutal methods of British colonial policy in order to make it clear what sort of liberty the nations which are protected by Great Britain really enjoy.

"But the climax of British hypocrisy is certainly to be found in the Halifax statement that Great Britain was not desirous of depriving the German *Volk* of the natural basis of its existence. No British statesman will succeed in obliterating by such siren songs the German *Volk's* recollection of the starvation blockade of the Great War, through which thousands of innocent German women and children were victimized. British Ministers had better not talk too much about their alleged peaceful intentions. So long as such declarations bear the mark of machinations of threat and intimidation, they will needs be considered as new proofs for the intention of encirclement by strong and proud nations like Germany and Italy, although Halifax thought that he might succeed in disguising such intentions by means of oratorical considerations.

"Provocations have never been a suitable method of initiating between two nations conversations based on a sincere readiness to reach mutual understanding."

(b) **Hitler Promises and Performances.**

The *Völkischer Beobachter*, 29th Sept., 1938.

The meaning of these words can best be understood by referring to the editorial of the same paper at the time of the Czechoslovak crisis of last year. When the fate of Czechoslovakia was in the balance and before the Munich Agreement, the *Völkischer Beobachter*, after re-stating the *Fuehrer's* case for the "liberation" and "self-determination" of Czechoslovakia, wrote, on the 29th September, 1938:

"These are the considerations which, for all who heartily desire peace, are alone of decisive moment. Beyond these, however—for the first time after five richly eventful years—the *Fuehrer* spoke yesterday that great word which again and again from all the official and non-official speakers for democracy has been asked of him; after the solution of the Sudeten problem Germany has no more territorial demands in the whole of Europe! This settlement is nothing else than the answer to that questionnaire which the former British Foreign Secretary, *Eden*, sent years too early to Berlin!

"This statement is Germany's final answer to all those who, for a long time, have sought to dispose of all Germany's vital demands with the justification that 'one did not know what Hitler would demand to-morrow, if he were met to-day in this or that sphere!' With yesterday's statement of the *Fuehrer*, Europe is liberated from the heaviest mountain load which did not until now allow millions to sleep. The *Fuehrer* was not able to make this statement earlier, because the liberation and unification of Germany, as the history of these five years has plainly demonstrated, was only possible, move by move, or not at all.

"To-day we stand, and Europe with us, close before the last stone of this great and dangerous road. The statesmen of the West must be regarded as madmen if they draw back before this last happy stride out of consideration for the political bankrupts of the Prague *Hradschin*."

(c) **Czechoslovakia, 1938 — Poland, 1939?**

The year 1938 saw Czechoslovakia destroyed by German foreign policy, by the use of words like "liberation" and "self-determination", and in the name of German *Lebensraum*. German foreign policy aims to make 1939 the year in which Poland shall become the subordinated instrument of the same German

Lebensraum. This is the immediate issue of which Danzig is the occasion, just as the Sudeten-Germans were the occasion of the "liberation" of Czechoslovakia.

From the study of *Adolf Hitler's* promises and *Adolf Hitler's* performances in what concerns his rape of Czechoslovakia and the enslavement of the Czech and Slovak peoples, one certainly emerges for the crisis of 1939: the certainty that *Adolf Hitler* can be relied upon to break his promises.

The effective comment of *Hitler* Germany upon the speech of *Lord Halifax*, is summed up in the Czechoslovakia promises of *Adolf Hitler* in 1938. The more outstanding are herewith reproduced for reference.

(d) **Some Hitler Promises.**

1. **From Herr Hitler's Berlin Ultimatum Speech, 26th September, 1938.**

"*Herr Hitler* then went on to deal with what he called: '*The Last Problem*':

'And now the last problem which must be solved, and which will be solved, confronts us. It is the last territorial claim which I have to make in Europe, but it is the claim from which I do not recede and which I shall fulfil, God willing.'"

2. **From the same speech, 26th Sept., 1938.**

"I am grateful to *Mr. Chamberlain* for all his efforts, and I have assured him that the German people want nothing but peace—simply that I cannot go back once beyond the limits of our patience. I have further assured him, and I stress it now, that when this problem is solved Germany has no more territorial problems in Europe."

3. **From the same speech, 26th Sept., 1938.**

"I have further advised him (i.e., *Mr. Chamberlain*) that at the moment when Czechoslovakia has solved its other problems—that is when the Czechs shall have come to an understanding with their other minorities—that I shall not be interested in the Czech State any more, and that so far as I am concerned I can guarantee it. We do not want any Czechs any more."

4. **The British Prime Minister's Broadcast, 27th Sept., 1938.**

"*Herr Hitler* told me privately, and last night he repeated publicly, that after this Sudeten German question is settled that is the end of Germany's territorial claims in Europe."

5. The British Prime Minister's Final Conversation at Godesburg, 28th Sept., 1938.

"I think I should add that before saying farewell to Herr Hitler I had a few words with him in private, which I do not think are without importance.

"In the first place he repeated, with great earnestness, what he had said already at Berchtesgaden, namely, that this was the last of his territorial ambitions in Europe and that he had no wish to include in the Reich people of other races than Germans."

*The Southern Post, Ltd., 149
Fleet Street, London, E.C.4
29993 5m 10.7.39*

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
THE GENERAL LIBRARIES
PERRY-CASTAÑEDA LIBRARY

DATE DUE	DATE RETURNED
PCL PCL PCL JUN 02 2005	RET'D PC MAY 25 2005
RET'D PCL APR 23	